



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,000	03/26/2004	Fred D. Mabe	03CR119/KE	9012

26383 7590 03/09/2010
ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
400 COLLINS ROAD NE
M/S 124-323
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52498

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHANDRAHAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2464

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/811,000	Applicant(s) MABE ET AL.	
	Examiner Chandrabhas Patel	Art Unit 2464	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 13-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Amendments made to claims necessitated finality of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 states "... increase one or more of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through said node entered into a routing table by an amount in order to discourage all but essential traffic" It is not clear from the claim language what is meant by increasing the metrics by an amount. The claims do not clearly state by what amount is the metrics increased by to allow all but essential traffic. Therefore, claim 13 fails to distinctly point out the subject matter which the applicant regards as his/her invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, 5, 17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goringe et al. (USPN 7,200,122) in view of Lor et al. (USPN 7,440,573).

Regarding claim 1, Goringe teaches a process for use as part of a routing protocol in an ad hoc digital communications network wherein the network is comprised of a plurality of nodes **[Fig. 1]** each of which includes a router including a routing table having routing information defining routing pathways through the network and including one or more metrics defining message transfer characteristics for each such routing pathway **[Fig. 2, 232]**, comprising the steps of: a) having a plurality of nodes exchange routing advertisement messages including routing pathways through the network and including one or more metrics defining message transfer costs for each routing pathway **[Col. 4, lines 6-33, plurality of routers exchange messages to get each others path connections]**; and d) having the updated routing table including adjusted metrics advertised across the network for the purpose of updating the routing tables of other nodes in the network **[Col. 8, lines 44-51, links are advertised across the network and listed in the router]**.

However, Goringe does not teach b) having one of the nodes check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node; c) having an advantaged node adjust one of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through the node entered into a routing table to form an updated routing table.

Lor teaches b) having one of the nodes check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node **[Col. 16, lines 1-20, the congestion information is determined by the access point of WLAN]**; c) having an advantaged node adjust one of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through the node entered into a routing table to form an updated routing table **[Col. 16, lines 21-39, the topology of paths is changed by**

switching some paths that access the AP to another AP, this will change the way in which traffic is routed].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust one of the metrics of a routing table so that when one of the AP gets overloaded the traffic can be rerouted through another node **[Col. 16, lines 50-67].**

Regarding claim 5, Goringe teaches a process for use as part of a routing protocol in an ad hoc digital communications network featuring differentiated services wherein the network is comprised of a plurality of nodes **[Fig. 1]** each of which includes a router having multidimensional routing information reflecting different code-point levels and defining routing pathways through the network for each code-point and one or more metrics defining message transfer characteristics for each such routing pathway for each code-point **[Fig. 7]**, comprising the steps of: a) having a plurality of nodes exchange routing advertisement messages including routing pathways for each code-point through the network and including one or more metrics defining message transfer costs for each routing pathway **[Col. 4, lines 6-51, plurality of routers exchange messages to get each others path connections, more than one routing protocols in use will generate more than one routing topology teaches different routing pathway for each code-point]**; and d) having the updated routing table advertised across the network for the purpose of updating the routing tables of other network nodes **[Col. 8, lines 44-51, links are advertised across the network and listed in the router]**.

However, Goringe does not teach b) having one of the nodes check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node; c) having an advantaged node increase one or more of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through said node entered into a routing table by amounts based on the code-point of the entry to form an updated routing table.

Lor teaches b) having one of the nodes check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node **[Col. 16, lines 1-20, the congestion information is determined by the access point of WLAN]**; c) having an advantaged node increase one or more of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through the node entered into a routing table by amounts based on the code-point of the entry to form an updated routing table **[Col. 16, lines 21-39, the topology of paths is changed by switching some paths that access the AP to another AP, this will change the way in which traffic is routed]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust one of the metrics of a routing table so that when one of the AP gets overloaded the traffic can be rerouted through another node **[Col. 16, lines 50-67]**.

Regarding claim 17, Goringe teaches a process for use as part of a routing protocol in a mobile ad hoc digital communications network composed of a plurality of nodes **[Fig. 1]** each of which includes a router having a routing table defining routing pathways through the network and including one or more metrics defining message transfer characteristics for each such routing pathway **[Fig. 2, 232]**, comprising the

steps of: a) exchanging routing information between a plurality of network nodes including routing pathways through the network and one or more metrics defining message transfer costs for each routing pathway; **[Col. 4, lines 6-33, plurality of routers exchange messages to get each others path connections]**; and d) advertising the updated routing table including adjusted metrics across the network for the purpose of updating the routing tables of other network nodes. **[Col. 8, lines 44-51, links are advertised across the network and listed in the router]**.

However, Goringe does not teach generating a measure the degree to which one of the nodes may comprise an advantaged node; c) adjusting one or more of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through the node as entered into its routing table as a function of the measure of the degree to which the node is an advantaged node to form an updated routing table to be used for advertising routing information.

Lor teaches generating a measure the degree to which one of the nodes may comprise an advantaged node; **[Col. 5, lines 11-19, the congestion information received determines that the router is in congestion state]**; c) adjusting one or more of the metrics of a plurality of routing pathways through the node as entered into its routing table as a function of the measure of the degree to which the node is an advantaged node to form an updated routing table to be used for advertising routing information; and **[Fig. 4, number of Routers is increased by one and Col. 5, lines 16-30, the paths are updated in the routing table to form an updated routing table]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust one of the metrics of a routing table so that packets can be prevented from being discarded or delayed **[Col. 5, lines 11-30]**.

Regarding claim 20, Goringe teaches a process for use as part of a routing protocol in an ad hoc digital communications network featuring differentiated services wherein the network is comprised of a plurality of nodes **[Fig. 1]** each of which includes a router having multidimensional routing information reflecting different code-point levels and defining routing pathways through the network for each code-point and one or more metrics defining message transfer characteristics for each such routing pathway for each code-point **[Fig. 7]**, comprising the steps of: a) exchanging routing information between a plurality of nodes including routing pathways for each code-point through the network and including one or more metrics defining message transfer costs for each routing pathway **[Col. 4, lines 6-51, plurality of routers exchange messages to get each others path connections, more than one routing protocols in use will generate more than one routing topology teaches different routing pathway for each code-point]**; and d) advertising the updated routing table including adjusted metrics across the network for the purpose of updating the routing tables of other nodes in the network **[Col. 8, lines 44-51, links are advertised across the network and listed in the router]**.

However, Goringe does not teach b) determining if a node comprises an advantaged node; c) adjusting one or more of the metrics for a plurality of routing

pathways through an advantaged node as entered into its routing table by amounts based on the code-point level of the entry to form an updated routing table.

Lor teaches b) determining if a node comprises an advantaged node [**Col. 6, lines 1-20, the congestion information received determines that the router is in congestion state**]; c) adjusting one or more of the metrics for a plurality of routing pathways through an advantaged node as entered into its routing table by amounts based on the code-point level of the entry to form an updated routing table [**Col. 16, lines 21-39, the topology of paths is changed by switching some paths that access the AP to another AP, this will change the way in which traffic is routed**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust one of the metrics of a routing table so that when one of the AP gets overloaded the traffic can be rerouted through another node [**Col. 16, lines 50-67**].

5. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 18, 19, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goringe et al. (USPN 7,200,122) in view of Lor et al. (USPN 7,440,573) and Elliott (USPN 7,139,262).

Regarding claims 2, 6, 21, Goringe teaches the process as discussed in rejection of claims 1, 5, 20.

However, Goringe does not teach having each node check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node includes the step of having the node calculate a ratio of

the node's neighbors to the average number of its neighbors' neighbors as a basis for determining if it is an advantaged node.

Elliott teaches having each node check to determine if it comprises an advantaged node includes the step of having the node calculate a ratio of the node's neighbors to the average number of its neighbors' neighbors as a basis for determining if it is an advantaged node **[Fig. 8 and Col. 7, lines 41-56, identifies number of neighbors based on number of hops away]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have node calculate a ratio of the node's neighbors to the average of its neighbors' neighbors to determine if it is an advantage node so that routing table of subsequent nodes can be updated accordingly by locating the advantage node **[Col. 2, lines 16-28]**.

Regarding claims 3, 19, 22, Goringe teaches routing protocol can comprise DSDV protocol **[Col. 1, lines 46-53, DSDV is distance-vector protocol]**.

However, Goringe does not teach adjusting one or more metrics of a plurality of routing pathways comprises incrementing the hop counts of the pathways.

Elliott teaches metric comprises hop count and step of adjusting one or more metrics of a plurality of routing pathways comprises incrementing the hop counts of the pathways **[Col. 7, lines 41-67 – Col. 8, lines 1-3]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to increment the hop counts of the pathways since introduction of new paths affects all other distances in the network **[Col. 7, lines 65-67]**.

Regarding claims 7, Goringe further teaches routing protocol comprises DSDV protocol and one or more metrics comprise hop count **[Col. 1, lines 46-53, DSDV is distance-vector protocol]**.

Regarding claim 18, Goringe teaches routing protocol comprises DSDV protocol and one or more metrics comprise hop count **[Col. 1, lines 46-53, DSDV is distance-vector protocol]**.

However, Goringe does not teach the measure of the degree to which a node comprises an advantage node is based on a ration of anode's neighbors to the average number of its neighbor nodes' neighbors.

Elliott teaches the measure of the degree to which a node comprises an advantage node is based on a ration of anode's neighbors to the average number of its neighbor nodes' neighbors **[Col. 7, lines 41-56]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have node calculate a ratio of the node's neighbors to the average of its neighbors' neighbors to determine the measure of the degree to which a node comprises and advantage node so that routing table of subsequent nodes can be updated accordingly by the degree to which the node comprises advantage node **[Col. 2, lines 16-28]**.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goringe et al. (USPN 7,200,122) in view of Lor et al. (USPN 7,440,573) and Elliott (USPN

7,139,262) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Kao et al. (USPN 7,212,490).

Regarding claim 4, Goringe teaches routing protocol comprises a link state protocol **[Col. 4, lines 19-26]**.

However, Goringe does not teach metric comprises latency.

Kao teaches metric comprises latency **[Abstract]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have transfer cost based on latency so that congestion between the nodes can be determined **[Col. 3, lines 48-57]**.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goringe et al. (USPN 7,200,122) in view of Lor et al. (USPN 7,440,573) and Kao et al. (USPN 7,212,490).

Regarding claim 8, Goringe teaches routing protocol comprises a link state protocol **[Col. 4, lines 19-26]**.

However, Goringe does not teach metric comprises latency.

Kao teaches metric comprises latency **[Abstract]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have transfer cost based on latency so that congestion between the nodes can be determined **[Col. 3, lines 48-57]**.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 9-16 are allowed.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 9, prior art teaches all limitations of the claim except having one of the nodes calculate a measure of the degree to which it comprises an advantaged node; having an advantaged node increase one or more of the metrics of a plurality of pathways through the node entered into its routing table to form an updated routing table as a function of the measure of the degree to which it comprises an advantaged node.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrahas Patel whose telephone number is (571)270-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 to 17:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ricky Ngo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2464

/Chandrahas Patel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2464